

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF WEST VIRGINIA  
ELKINS**

**MARQUEZ T. HOLMES,**

Petitioner,

**v.**

**CIVIL ACTION NO. 2:17-CV-79  
(BAILEY)**

**DEWAYNE HENDRIX, Warden,**

Respondent.

**ORDER ADOPTING REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION**

On this day, the above-styled matter came before this Court for consideration of the Report and Recommendation of United States Magistrate Judge James E. Seibert [Doc. 19]. Pursuant to this Court's Local Rules, this action was referred to Magistrate Judge Seibert for submission of a proposed report and recommendation ("R&R"). Magistrate Judge Seibert filed his R&R on March 14, 2018, wherein he recommends this Court grant respondent's construed Motion for Summary Judgment [Doc. 12], deny the petitioner's § 2241 Petition [Doc. 1], and dismiss the Petition with prejudice.

Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(c), this Court is required to make a *de novo* review of those portions of the magistrate judge's findings to which objection is made. However, the Court is not required to review, under a *de novo* or any other standard, the factual or legal conclusions of the magistrate judge as to those portions of the findings or recommendation to which no objections are addressed. *Thomas v. Arn*, 474 U.S. 140, 150 (1985). In addition, failure to file timely objections constitutes a waiver of *de novo* review and the right to appeal this Court's Order. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1); *Snyder v.*

*Ridenour*, 889 F.2d 1363, 1366 (4th Cir. 1989); *United States v. Schronce*, 727 F.2d 91, 94 (4th Cir. 1984). Here, objections to Magistrate Judge Seibert's R&R were due within fourteen (14) days of service, pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1) and Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b). The docket reflects that service was accepted on March 19, 2018 [Doc. 20]. To date, no objections have been filed. Accordingly, this Court will review the R&R for clear error.


Upon careful review of the above, it is the opinion of this Court that the Report and Recommendation [Doc. 19] should be, and is, hereby **ORDERED ADOPTED** for the reasons more fully stated in the magistrate judge's report. Accordingly, this Court **GRANTS** respondent's construed Motion for Summary Judgment [Doc. 12]. Further, this Court **ORDERS** that the petitioner's Petition for Habeas Corpus Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2241 [Doc. 1] be **DENIED** and **DISMISSED WITH PREJUDICE**. This Court further **ORDERS** that this matter be **STRICKEN** from the active docket of this Court and **DIRECTS** the Clerk to enter judgment in favor of the respondent.

As a final matter, upon an independent review of the record, this Court hereby **DENIES** a certificate of appealability, finding that the petitioner has failed to make "a substantial showing of the denial of a constitutional right." 28 U.S.C. § 2253(c)(2).

It is so **ORDERED**.

The Clerk is directed to transmit copies of this Order to any counsel of record herein and to mail a copy to the *pro se* petitioner.

**DATED:** April 9, 2018.



JOHN PRESTON BAILEY  
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE